

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/7,10,512	KOSELKA ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Jeremiah C. Huber	2621	

All Participants:
(1) Jeremiah C. Huber.
(2) Joseph Mayo.
Date of Interview: 19 October 2006

Status of Application: After Non-Final Rejection
(3) _____.
(4) _____.
Time: 2:00 P.M.

Type of Interview:
☒ Telephonic
☐ Video Conference
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)
Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☒ No
If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.
Rejection(s) discussed:
102(e)

Claims discussed:
34, 39 and 44

Prior art documents discussed:
US 2005/0237385 (Kosaka et al.)

Part II.
SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:
See Continuation Sheet

Part III.
☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

(Examiner/SPE Signature)
(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Examiner discussed amendments with applicant and explained why the amendments do not overcome prior art. Examiner proposed supplemental amendments to clarify applicant's claims, particularly an indication that the first axial angle is a fixed angle. The applicant agreed to submit an amendment including the suggested clarification and a document pointing out support in the specification..